

Remarks

Claims 1-46, 48 and 58 have been canceled, claims 47, 51-53, 55-57, 60 and 61 are amended herein. Support for these amendments can be found, *inter alia*, on page 13, lines 8-10 and on page 14, lines 11-13. Claims 47, 49-57 and 59-63 are pending in the application.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 47, 49-57 and 59-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Harris *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,871,683) in view of Raysberg *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,106,583) and Brennan (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,672). (Office Action, page 2.)

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. (See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2142 (eighth edition, revision 5, August 2006).) First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

As amended herein, independent claims 47, 53 and 56 recite “a plurality of movable stations positioned above said carousel.” Neither Harris *et al.*, Raysberg *et al.* or Brennan teach or suggest stations which are movable. Applicants believe that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established for the amended claims and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 47, 49-57 and 59-63 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being obvious over Feygin *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,890,491) in view of Raysberg *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,106,583) and Brennan (U.S. Patent No. 5,472,672). (Office Action, page 4.)

As discussed above, amended independent claims 47, 53 and 56 recite “a plurality of movable stations positioned above said carousel.” Neither Feygin *et al.*, Raysberg *et al.* or Brennan teach or suggest stations that are movable. Applicants believe that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established for the amended claims and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter G. Foiles/

Peter G. Foiles
Agent for Applicants
(240) 379-4173
Registration No. 46,477

Date: November 6, 2006